

From: yvonneroger@comcast.net
To: [*CI-StPaul>Contact-Council](#)
Subject: Rent Control
Date: Monday, September 5, 2022 9:47:52 PM

Hi Elaine,

Thank you for inviting me to add my comments to your email with the hope it can be presented to Councilman Tolbert.

Rent control has been an issue I've followed since before the referendum. It is disappointing that the council has been hesitant to interpret the appropriate intent of the ordinance. The critical issues you brought forth in your email are my concern as well. I totally disagree with amendments exempting developers from a 3% cap for 15 plus years. Where did this magic number originate? 5 years to observe the impact on housing but not 15 plus! Also never should this be applied retroactively for any reason. Past is past and we hope to improve on that in the present. When this effort originated (according to the national research offered) it seemed clear enough that 3% was a fair and doable per cent and still met some of the housing needs. My fear is that as part of our political and capitalistic society, developers are less interested in affordable housing and more motivated to force this issue whereby thwarting the purpose of the ordinance....affordable housing. It is disappointing that Mr Tolbert has basically usurped the intent of the ordinance.

I am sorry I am unable to attend the September 6 meeting. Thank you for sharing my views. Yvonne Leick

Councilmember Chris Tolbert
310-C City Hall 15 Kellogg Blvd. West
Saint Paul, MN 55102

Dear Councilmember Tolbert,

I am Sr. Kathie McLaughlin, CSJ, one of your constituents and a founding member of a justice work group of the Sisters of St. Joseph, CSJ Homes and Hearts. I write to you regarding St. Paul's rent stabilization.

The vision of CSJ Homes and Hearts is that we believe every person has a right to a place to call home. Our mission is to act on our profound love for all people through advocacy and direct service to the people experiencing homelessness in the Twin Cities community.

I was thrilled to see rent stabilization pass in St. Paul, because I want the families living in our Provincial House through Project Home to be able to afford their rent once they move out and remain in their homes for as long as they wish: I do not want them to face homelessness again. I appreciate that you helped find temporary funding for Project Home.

But now I understand that there are proposals to take away rent stability protection from so many rental places all through St. Paul, and I'm very concerned about what will happen to the children and their families if they move into a place only to have to move again when rents increase beyond their abilities to afford.

Taking away rent stabilization is not only heartless, it is short-sighted. Children struggle to learn when they must move even once, let alone frequently. These children are our future. We need children to learn, thrive, and contribute to our community as they grow up. Rent stability is meant to help families put down roots and thrive.

Please do not weaken rent stabilization – instead, please do all you can to make sure that people whose incomes are the lowest have as much protection as possible through rent stabilization. I understand that Councilmember Mitra Jalali has a proposal for that to happen. Please listen to and work with her.

Sincerely,
Sr. Kathie McLaughlin
525 South Fairview Avenue, #314
St. Paul, MN 55116

September 5, 2022

Councilmember Chris Tolbert
310-C City Hall 15 Kellogg Blvd. West
Saint Paul, MN 55102

Dear Councilmember Tolbert,

I am Sr. Susan Hames, CSJ, one of your constituents and one of the leaders of the Sisters of St. Joseph, St. Paul Province, when we chose to partner with Project Home to house families in our Provincial House. I appreciate that you helped find temporary funding for Project Home.

I write to you regarding St. Paul's rent stabilization. Our mission is to move always toward love of God and love of neighbor without distinction. I was so happy when rent stabilization passed in St. Paul, because I want Project Home families (and all families) to be able to afford their rent. I do not want families to face homelessness again or need to move frequently.

It's my understanding that there are proposals to remove rent stabilization protection from many rental places in St. Paul, and I'm concerned about the children and their families. I do not want them to move into a place and need to move again when rents increase too much, or worse, find themselves homeless again.

Taking away rent stabilization is heartless and short-sighted. Children dealing with homelessness or moving frequently struggle to learn and thrive. These children are our future, and we need them to have stability so they can learn and contribute to our community. Rent stability is meant to help families put down roots and thrive.

Please do all you can to make sure that people whose incomes are the lowest have as much protection as possible through rent stabilization. I understand that Councilmember Mitra Jalali has a proposal to do so. Please support her proposal.

Sincerely,

Sr. Susan Hames
525 South Fairview Avenue, #426
St. Paul, MN 55116

From: [Kate O'Connell and Gary Olson](#)
To: [*CI-StPaul>Contact-Council](#)
Cc: [Jalali, Mitra \(CI-StPaul\)](#)
Subject: Rent Stabilization Chapter 193 A
Date: Sunday, September 4, 2022 2:04:13 PM

Dear Councilmembers,

I write to support St. Paul children and their families who need rent stability to remain in their housing, so they can grow and thrive for the benefit of all of St. Paul. I am a long-time volunteer with Project Home, which provides temporary housing to some (not all) children and their families experiencing homelessness and I help children with reading. I've learned over the years that homelessness and housing instability damages children's abilities to thrive, let alone learn and grow, and those experiences remain with children throughout their lives.

I appreciate some of the amendments that were proposed on August 3, 2022 to Chapter 193 A, such as keeping the 3% annual increase approved by voters and clarifying who pays for utilities. I also **support all of the amendments offered on August 24, 2022 by Councilmembers Mitra Jalali, Rebecca Noecker and Amy Brendmoen.**

However, I am deeply troubled by the amendments to exempt many rental units from rent stabilization, especially rental units that already exist, along with the proposal for vacancy decontrol and the practice of automatically approving rent increases up to 8%, with no prior notice to renters.

As noted above, I support all of the amendments offered at the 8/24/22 meeting except the amendment for vacancy decontrol. I especially highlight the following regarding exemptions:

- Please do not exempt rental facilities that already exist (no look-back, per an amendment proposed by Councilmember Jalali),
- Please use Councilmember Jalali's proposed amendment regarding application to low-income units,
- Please use an approach similar to the amendment proposed by Councilmember Brendmoen regarding prevailing wages to define "New Construction" as meaning new units that provide at least 50% of the units for low-income housing for people at 30 percent AMI. This approach is intended to address the stated need for new low-income housing.

Finally, please do not automatically approve rent increases below 8%. It appears that the basis for this approach is linked to the Consumer Price Index. However, while Councilmember Noecker's proposal to link non-capital operation and maintenance costs to the CPI may be reasonable, it is not reasonable to assume that the landlord's principle (capital costs), interest or property taxes of rental units will increase by the CPI.

For example, if a landlord has not yet paid off a loan to finance the rental unit, the principle of the loan typically does not increase over the term of the loan, so it is not reasonable to automatically approve an increase by CPI to that portion of rent. Similarly, if the landlord has a fixed interest rate, that amount remains fixed and should not be allowed to increase automatically. Property taxes may or may not increase; actual increases should be allowed,

but that amount is only part of the cost of providing rental units.

Thank you for listening.

Kate O'Connell
1506 Simpson Street
St. Paul, MN 55108

1 of 11

9-01-22

To: Council President Brandon and council,
City of St. Paul.

From: Rebecca J. Cassidy
1944 Cromwell Ave
St. Paul, MN. 55114
Cassidy364@gmail.com
651-815-7725
Landlord since 1976

Re: 3% percent cap on Rent increases

I would first like to request a stay of the decision in front of the Council regarding 3% rent cap to include all of following:

The following reasons are why:

- 1) It appears that no market analysis has been done looking specifically at the "mom and pop," base contribution to the stability of the rental housing shortage in St. Paul. The dynamics of your base of landlords needs to be studied as to how and what is needed to back up these middle income landlords most assuredly for retention.

This base of non corporate landlords is facing all of the following without acknowledgement by the city, in its proposed 3% rent cap increase

- A) We are of an aging demographic
- B) We are most least likely to qualify for grants to supplement property rental upgrades and fall usually slightly out of the range to qualify for support for better rental accommodations
- C) All of the city has clay sewer lines many of these need replacement for a cost of between 6K and 10K due to the sheer age of these sewer lines.
- D) In my case I have seen my once disabled homestead allowance of an initial 50% fall to 25% as property taxes

have increased but the disability homestead allowances has remained at the same percentage in 1980's to Present.

E) There is no property tax relief for the base of these mom and pop landlords (many of whom are seniors) its at time to consider a moratorium on property taxes for those landlords who are most likely to suborn to the weight of the 3% cap and now a 15% property tax increase by selling out to investor buyers who will increase rents thereby defeating the goal of retention of affordable rentals!

F) If all 3 entities are support it would have to include support of the mom and pop

Page 11

base to include an awareness that by virtue of giving a 3% mandated cap rent you will likely affect the back bone of city rentals that are ready to drop under the demands placed upon them. Mom & Pop landlord base is in a position of not being able to sustain their rentals with the 3% cap due to the sheer economics of their finances. Most landlords have no 401K or Golden Parachute to fall back on. Most are marginally financially solvent after covid and new potential restrictions on rental increase. I am a believer in if you are going to pressure the mom and pops with a burden of supporting those renters in

Page 4

need of housing then
consider showing up
the support by offering
them sewer line repair,
tax moratorium,
catastrophic relief funding
available when a
renter fails or refuses
rent payments or evicts
a unit. Just 3 mos
of rent not being
paid can threaten
a landlord's ability
to remain in the
landlord role without
considering a sale of
the rental.

Don't be penny wise
but pound foolish by
not setting up a
contingency fund for
landlord to access
when overwhelmed
with costs that exceed
the rental income.
If you consider us
as part of the team
rather than part of

6 of 11

1/2 you will find ways to provide for an infrastructure, if you will that supports the mom and pop with a view of them as allies

6.) Corporate rentals asking for and possibly receiving (on their rental property) an 20 - or 30 year stay of the 3rd floor is a scene with asking them for something in return to support the city annually for the usage of services (i.e. ambulance, police etc) that will be extraordinary due to the density and access reality. If you have a Ryan property of 100 units all of a sudden a 20 call turns into a 2 hour call just to navigate the inside of a corporate owned property. This clearly takes away from

7 of 11

the masses who may have only a golden 1 hour from call to ex to service.

What the point of this is "don't cut off an opportunity to leverage a corporate request with cities as for annual funds to go into a contingency fund to support the increased demands on the cities for response, fireman, transportation, pollution and on and on without receiving a kind of funds to support the impact/drain/imprint on our cities quality of life. If they get a free pass how will the city continue to pay for this megadrain on cities resources. If they want no

8 of 11

restriction on the 3%
then on all means
negotiate an imprint
surcharge or quality
surcharge that will
support the cities
infrastructure needs and
psycho/social needs
impacted by the sheer
demand of corporate
level volume/dense building
No one losses if the
city does this.

Other areas of coverage
by the establishment
of an imprint contiguous
fund could be identified
such as across the
board support for
landlords & renters
who are the other
side of the equation.
The Council has a
golden opportunity
to secure funding
by pairing this imprint fee
requested to be paid
annually to the

9 of 11

contingency imprint
fund with the pass
to waive the 3% cap
for 15 years. I would
consider a waiver only
if packed with an
annual gift to the
city of a percentage
to cover inflationary costs
for added police, fire
and first responders as
well as infrastructure demands
with ^{high} density building.
The other request would be
an inclusion of a park on site
for high density building.

In closing please don't
view the landlord population
in an adversarial
light but as a team
moving to build retention
of homes/rental for those
needing housing.
Please call if questions
arise on my input.
I have been especially
concerned that this

10 of 11

issue has evolved
into a us against
them issue. With a
restate of "Team" instead
as I think we can
move more quickly
to a consensus.

All parties moving toward
retention is the goal mean
those who are capable of
paying their share of
expenses to do volume
density building in our
city of St. Paul.

Please excuse the
informality of this
note however due
to time restraints
I am submitting this
by hand,

You are all extraordinary
in your contribution
to the city and con-
tinue to do without
the demonizing of the
landlords' role in

1/28/11

retention on all sides
of the equation?

Thank you for the
opportunity to submit
this proposal which
asks for a delay on
the vote ^{until} to consider
and negotiate a
counter to demands
by corporate builders
to take from the
city without considera-
tion of the weight
this 15 year moratorium
will pass on to the
taxpayers and the city,
Compliment the mom
and Pop Landlord
with comparable support
in every way to retain
and stave off investor
raiders of duplex/
triplexes and 2 plus therapy
circumventing an effort to keep rents affordable.

Respectfully,
Rebecca Crossley
944 Cromwell Ave
St. Paul MN 55114

651 815 7735

From: Iain Dove Lempke <ian.lempke@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2022 05:27 PM
To: #CI-StPaul_Ward1 <Ward1@ci.stpaul.mn.us>
Subject: Please Keep Committed to Rent Stabilization

Think Before You Click: This email originated **outside** our organization.

Hi Councilmember Ballenger,

My name is Iain Dove McAfee and I live in Ward 1 (967 Iglehart Ave). I'm contacting you to share my thoughts about amendments being advanced to change the rent stabilization policy. While I've been a home owner since summer of 2021, I spent well over a decade renting in the Twin Cities, most of which was in St. Paul. I have experienced first-hand just how much harder it has become to find housing in our city, and much of that is due to rapidly rising rents. That's why I ask you to support the following amendments:

Amendments to Support (In order of greatest importance)

- Re-include certain types of affordable subsidized housing (LIHTC, S8 voucher, etc.) in the rent stabilization policy so renters in affordable housing can benefit from the policy
- Rolling 15 year new construction exemption beginning Jan 1 2023 with no look back (exemption would only apply to buildings built starting in 2023 and would last for 15 years)
- The revised just cause language that gets rid of the subjective "disorderly conduct" category and adds relocation assistance to tenants displaced by certain landlord-driven actions. If a landlord requests for an exemption to the 3% rent increase limit, a tenant needs to be notified when the request is received by the city (not when the exemption request is approved) to give tenants more time to appeal a final determination
- Requiring landlords to notify tenants if their unit is not rent stabilized prior to rent agreement

Chris Tolbert's ideas have some merit - it *is* true that a lack of supply *is* a major factor driving rents up. However, protecting renters and honoring what the voters of St. Paul chose on the referendum are imperative to make this all work for everyone.

I ask that you vote in favor of these amendments. I look forward to hearing from you about this.

Thank you!
Iain Dove McAfee